UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/016,796	10/26/2001	Harald Krodel	10537/172	6056

26646 7590 10/20/2004

KENYON & KENYON
ONE BROADWAY
NEW YORK, NY 10004

EXAMINER	
BADII, BEHRANG	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3621	

DATE MAILED: 10/20/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/016,796	KRODEL, HARALD	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Behrang Badii	3621	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *26 October 2001*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-9* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-9* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *26 October 2001* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-9 have been examined.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pauschinger (U.S. patent 6,523,014) in view of Sakakibara (U.S. patent 6,798,463) and further in view of Cilurzo et al. (6,434,526). Pauschinger discloses method for verifying (checking, confirming) electronic data records including at least one of electronic shipping (postal)-voucher data and shipping (postal) data sent by a sender to an information system, comprising the steps of:

- receiving the electronic data record by the information system; (col. 3, lines 36-67)
- checking the data record by the information system for a presence of errors; (col. 3, lines 36-67)
- routing the data record to a receiver if the data record is error-free; (col. 3, lines 36-67).

Pauschinger does not disclose storing the data record in a defined access area of the information system if the data record is faulty, the data record stored in the defined access area being examinable by the sender and revisable. Sakakibara discloses

storing the data record in a defined access area of the information system if the data record is faulty (col. 3, lines 48-55). Cilurzo et al. discloses the data record stored in the defined access area being examinable by the sender and revisable (col. 4, lines 55-60). It would have been obvious to modify Pauschinger to include storing the data record in a defined access area of the information system if the data record is faulty such as that taught by Sakakibara and the data record stored in the defined access area being examinable by the sender and revisable such as that taught by Cilurzo et al. in order to separate the incorrect information from the correct information so that the user can correct the incorrect information more efficiently by knowing the storage area of the incorrect information and also for generating valid data for imprints, so that valid postage values with valid addresses can be printed onto the piece of mail .

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pauschinger, Sakakibara and Cilurzo et al. as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Marshal et al. (U.S. patent 6,773,347). Marshal et al. discloses adjusting information of the data record in accordance with ordering information stored in a database (col. 5, lines 15-25). It would have been obvious to further modify Pauschinger to include adjusting information of the data record in accordance with ordering information stored in a database such as that taught by Marshal et al. in order to categorize the data such that searching will be facilitated in accordance to the ordering information.

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pauschinger, Sakakibara and Cilurzo et al. as applied to claim 1 above, and further in

view of Ross et al. (U.S. patent 6,332,098). Ross et al. discloses a plurality of at least one of plants and areas of plant operations of a system provider jointly at a single central location (col. 9, lines 49-62). It would have been obvious to further modify Pauschinger to include a plurality of at least one of plants and areas of plant operations of a system provider jointly at a single central location such as that taught by Ross et al. in order to have the information of the plurality of plants at a single location so that locating a particular plant becomes feasible.

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pauschinger, Sakakibara and Cilurzo et al. as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Konosu et al. (U.S. patent 5,640,684). Konosu et al. discloses

- analyzing a number and a type of errors of faulty data records contained in the defined access area with respect to development over time (col. 9, lines 55-67); and
- displaying information in the defined access area in accordance with the analyzing step (col. 9, lines 55-67).

It would have been obvious to further modify Pauschinger to include analyzing a number and a type of errors of faulty data records contained in the defined access area with respect to development over time, and displaying information in the defined access area in accordance with the analyzing step such as that taught by Konosu et al. in order to discover common sources of problems and errors such that certain errors or categories of errors can be grouped together.

Claim 5, is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pauschinger (U.S. patent 6,523,014) in view of Sakakibara (U.S. patent 6,798,463), Cilurzo et al. (6,434,526) and further in view of Tourunen et al. (U.S. patent application publication US 2001/0043579 A1). Pauschinger discloses an information system for verifying electronic data records containing at least one of electronic shipping-voucher data and shipping data sent by a sender to the information system, comprising:

- a first interface configured to receive a transmitted electronic data record (col. 3, lines 36-67);
- a processing unit configured to recognize a faulty data record (col. 3, lines 36-67);

Pauschinger does not disclose a defined access area configured to store the faulty data record, the data records contained in the defined access area being inspectable and revisable by the sender; and a second interface configured to route a faulty data record to a receiver. Sakakibara discloses a defined access area configured to store the faulty data record (col. 3, lines 48-55). Cilurzo et al. discloses the data records contained in the defined access area being inspectable and revisable by the sender (col. 4, lines 55-60). Tourunen et al. discloses an interface configured to route a faulty data record to a receiver (page 1, [003]). It would have been obvious to modify Pauschinger to include a defined access area configured to store the faulty data record such as that taught by Sakakibara, to include the data records contained in the defined access area being inspectable and revisable by the sender as that taught by Cilurzo, and to include an interface configured to route a faulty data record to a receiver as that taught by

Tourunen in order to separate the wrong information from the correct information so that the user can correct the incorrect information more efficiently by knowing the storage area of the incorrect information.

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pauschinger, Sakakibara, Cilurzo et al. and Tourunen et al. as applied to claim 5 above, and further in view of Bernard et al. (U.S. patent 5,918,213). Bernard et al. disclose an interface to a database containing order information (col. 58, lines 65-67; col. 59, lines 1-7). It would have been obvious to further modify Pauschinger to include an interface to a database containing order information such as that taught by Bernard et al. in order to have a direct interface to the database containing order information for facilitating the access and search through the order information.

Claims 7, 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pauschinger, Sakakibara, Cilurzo et al. and Tourunen et al. As per claim 7, Cilurzo et al. discloses data records contained in the defined access area are inspectable and revisable by the sender (user) via the Internet (col. 4, lines 55-60; col. 5, lines 27-35). As per claim 8, Cilurzo et al. discloses the faulty data records stored in the defined access area which are inspectable by the receiver (user) (col. 4, lines 55-60). As per claim 9, Cilurzo et al. discloses the data records contained in the defined access area which are inspectable and revisable by the sender (user) via a data network (col. 4, lines 55-60). It would have been obvious to further modify Pauschinger to include data records contained in the defined access area are inspectable and revisable by the sender (user) via the Internet, the faulty data records stored in the

defined access area which are inspectable by the receiver (user) and the data records contained in the defined access area which are inspectable and revisable by the sender (user) via a data network such as that taught by Cilurzo et al. in order for the user to be able to change and make corrections to the data and then send the data via the network to the receiving party and also for the receiving party to be able to make changes to the information as necessary.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Behrang Badii whose telephone number is 703-305-0530. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Trammell can be reached on 703-305-9768. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Behrang Badii
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 3621
October 13, 2004

BB

JAMES P. TRAMMELL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600